1	WRIGHT, FINLAY & ZAK, LLP	
2	Matthew S. Carter, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 9524	
3	R. Samuel Ehlers, Esq.	
4	Nevada Bar No. 9313 7785 W. Sahara Ave., Suite 200	
5	Las Vegas, NV 89117 (702) 475-7964; Fax: (702) 946-1345	
	sehlers@wrightlegal.net	
6 7	Attorneys for Plaintiff, Bank of America, N.A., Successor By Merger to Bac Home Loans Servicing, LP f/k/a Countrywide Home Loans Servicing, LP	
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
9	BANK OF AMERICA, N.A., SUCCESSOR	Case No.: 2:17-cv-02808-APG-CWH
10	BY MERGER TO BAC HOME LOANS	2.17 07 02000 TH 0 0 111
11	SERVICING, LP F/K/A COUNTRYWIDE HOME LOANS SERVICING, LP,	STIPULATION AND ORDER TO STAY
12	Plaintiff,	CASE FOR 90 DAYS
13	vs.	
14	v 5.	
15	SATICOY BAY LLC SERIES, a Nevada limited liability company,	
16	Defendant.	
17		
18	COMES NOW, Plaintiff, BANK OF AMERICA, N.A., SUCCESSOR BY MERGER	
19	TO BAC HOME LOANS SERVICING, LP F/K/A COUNTRYWIDE HOME LOANS	
20	SERVICING, LP ("BANA" or "Plaintiff"), and Defendant, SATICOY BAY LLC SERIES	
21	("Saticoy Bay" or "Defendant") (together referred to as "Parties") by and through their	
22	respective undersigned counsels of record and hereby stipulate and agree as follows:	
23		
24	1. That this matter shall be stayed for 90 days pursuant to the agreement of the Parties as	
25	the Parties are discussing possible settlement and because the certified question in SFR	
26	Investment Pool 1, LLC v. Bank of New York Mellon (NRAP 5) Supreme Court Case	
27		
	1	

Page 1 of 3

NO. 72931 ("Certified Question Case") may be informative to this Court regarding both parties claims to quiet title to property at 4955 South Jeffreys #705, Las Vegas, Nevada 89119, APN #162-26-512-095 (hereinafter the "Property").

- 2. The Parties believe that significant judicial resources will be saved if the Court refrains from issuing a decision in this until after Case No. 72931. Both Parties hereby stipulate that neither side is agreeing to the legal effect of the Certified Question Case or that it will necessarily be dispositive of the entire case but that it could certainly affect the Parties positions once a decision has been made.
- 3. The Parties agree that the current discovery dates should be vacated and reset after the 90 days has passed. The parties shall submit an updated scheduling order with new dates for disclosing experts and for the close of discovery once the 90 days has passed.
- 4. The Parties further agree that the Stipulation to Amend the Complaint, service of the Amended Complaint, or any Answer, Responsive Pleading to the Amended Complaint, or cross-claim and service thereof, shall not be subject to this Stay unless otherwise agreed to by the Parties.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: July 27, 2018.

Page 3 of 3